## REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

No claims have been canceled, added, or amended. Hence, Claims 1-23, 47, and 49-72 are pending in the present application.

The issues raised in the Office Action mailed November 23, 2010 are addressed hereinafter.

I. ISSUES RELATED TO THE CITED ART

A. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

Claim 1 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Abrams et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,675,350 ("ABRAMS") in view of Schaeck, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0163513 ("SCHAECK2"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Among other features, Claim 1 comprises the features of:

> generating and storing a **mapping** that **maps one or more page parameter names** to **one or more portlet parameter names**, wherein **the mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with one or more page parameters that correspond to the one or more page parameter names**;
> …;
> **in response to receiving the request to display the web page**, performing the steps of:
> **determining** that the web page is associated with a **particular page parameter** that has a **particular page parameter name** from the one or more page parameter names;
> …;
> wherein **using the mapping** includes retrieving and **inspecting the mapping to determine that the particular page parameter name is mapped to a particular portlet parameter name that corresponds to a particular portlet parameter of a portlet**;
> …;
> passing a **value** associated with the **particular page parameter name** to the portlet **as a value of the particular portlet parameter** that corresponds to the **particular portlet parameter name**;
>
> … .

It is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS and SCHAECK2, whether taken alone or in combination, do not describe the above features of Claim 1.

1. SCHAECK2 does not describe the mapping of Claim 1

The Office Action asserts that SCHAECK2 describes the feature of Claim 1 of generating and storing a mapping that maps one or more page parameter names to one or more portlet parameter names, wherein the mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with one or more page parameters that correspond to the one or more page parameter names. This assertion is incorrect.

SCHAECK2 describes a system that provides a view of an aggregated service, where the view is provided by a portlet that is specific to a user role that is associated with the view. (See SCHAECK2, paragraphs [0020], [0074]-[0076].) The user role is stored in a user profile of the user. (See SCHAECK2, paragraphs [0021]-[0022].) At run-time, a portal aggregation component determines the particular role of the user from the user profile, selects the portlet corresponding to the view of the aggregated service associated with the particular role, and generates a portal page for the user that includes the selected portlet. (See SCHAECK2, paragraphs [0021]-[0022], [0068]-[0069], [0073].) In order to determine which role corresponds to which view of the aggregated service, at run-time the portal aggregation component checks a linkage that is provided by elements expressed in the XLink language. (See SCHAECK2, paragraphs [0024], [0074].)

Significantly, however, the file with the XLink elements does **not** map page parameter names to portlet parameter names. Rather, as clearly illustrated in its Fig. 6 and explained in paragraphs [0076]-[0078], the XLink elements map a **portlet archive file** (or "PAR" file that packages a collection of portlets) to a particular **view of the aggregated service**. This PAR-file-to-view mapping has nothing to do with the portlet-parameter-name-to-page-parameter-name required by Claim 1. It neither conveys the same information, nor can it be used in the same way (much less the specific way that Claim 1 requires it to be used).

For example, in Fig. 6 SCHAECK2 describes that a file named "inventory.par" is mapped to a view named "Vendor.Managed.Inventory.WebService" (see Fig. 6, the elements tagged as "<LogicReference… />" "<ViewReference… />", and "<Bridge… />"). Thus, Fig. 6 of SCHAECK2 clearly illustrates that the XLink elements that are used during run-time to generate a portal page for a user do **not** map any portlet parameter names to any page parameter names. In fact, Fig. 6 of SCHAECK2 clearly shows that the file with the XLink elements does not even need to provide a mapping at the granularity of individual page parameters and portlet parameters because the purpose of the file is to associate a view of the aggregated service with a PAR file that stores the portlet corresponding to that view.

In contrast, the mapping in Claim 1 maps one or more **page parameter names** to one or more **portlet parameter names**, where the page parameter names correspond to page parameters that are associated with web pages, and the portlet parameter names correspond to portlet parameters that are associated with portlets. Since the XLink elements in SCHAECK2 do not map (and do not even need to map) page parameters to portlet parameters, SCHAECK2 does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 1 of generating and storing a mapping that maps one or more page parameter names to one or more portlet parameter names, wherein the mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with one or more page parameters that correspond to the one or more page parameter names.

2. ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 do not describe the functionality of using the mapping that is featured in Claim 1

Claim 1 includes the features of: **in response to receiving the request to display the web page**, performing the steps of: **determining** that the web page is associated with a **particular page parameter** that has a **particular page parameter name** from the one or more page parameter names; … wherein **using the mapping** includes retrieving and **inspecting the mapping to determine that the particular page parameter name is mapped to a particular**

**portlet parameter name that corresponds to a particular portlet parameter of a portlet**; … passing a **value** associated with the **particular page parameter name** to the portlet **as a value of the particular portlet parameter** that corresponds to the **particular portlet parameter name**. These features of Claim 1 indicate that in response to a request to display the web page, the mapping is inspected to automatically determine which page parameter name maps to which portlet parameter name, and based on the determination a value associated with a page parameter is passed to a portlet as the value of the portlet parameter that is mapped to the page parameter according to the mapping.

The Office Action acknowledges that ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the mapping featured in Claim 1. Further, since as discussed above SCHAECK2 does not describe or suggest such mapping either, it is respectfully submitted that any combination of ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 does not and cannot possibly describe or suggest any functionality that corresponds to the functionality of using the mapping of Claim 1 as indicted in the above features of the claim. Specifically, there is no way to use a PAR-file-to-view mapping "**to determine that the particular page parameter name is mapped to a particular portlet parameter name that corresponds to a particular portlet parameter of a portlet".**

3. The mapping described in paragraph [0062] of SCHAECK2 does not correspond to the mapping of Claim 1

The Office Action acknowledges that the combination of ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 does not describe a mapping that maps page parameter names to portlet parameter names. However, on page 7 the Office Action argues that in paragraph [0062] SCHAECK2 describes a mapping which, when combined with some knowledge from the computer science arts, would suggest the mapping of Claim 1. This assertion is incorrect.

In paragraph [0062], SCHAECK2 describes data mapping information that indicates that output parameters of **one service** are mapped to the input parameters **of another service**.

Significantly, in this paragraph SCHAECK2 expressly describes that the data mapping information is used for a directed graph that **models** the operations involved in executing an aggregated service. Similar to the SCHAECK2's PAR-file-to-view, this outputting-service-to-inputting-service mapping cannot be the claimed portlet-parameter-name-to-page-parameter-name mapping, and therefore cannot be used "**to determine that the particular page parameter name is mapped to a particular portlet parameter name that corresponds to a particular portlet parameter of a portlet".**

In particular, the disclosed use of SCHAECK2's outputting-service-to-inputting-service mapping is merely **visually modeling** the operations of the aggregated service. This use is not related to how a view of an aggregated service is provided to a user based on the user's role. It is clear that the directed graph described in paragraph [0062] of SCHAECK2 is **not** used at run-time by a portal aggregation component to generate a portal page for the user. Further, it is noted that the relationships indicated in SCHAECK2's outputting-service-to-inputting-service mapping relate to service/operation parameters and not to **page parameters of web pages**. Thus, SCHAECK2's outputting-service-to-inputting-service mapping cannot possibly correspond to the mapping required by Claim 1.

Further, regarding the mapping of Claim 1, it is noted that a variable is a symbolic name that exists **only** in the **source code** of a program. When the source code is compiled into executable code, the variable ceases to be referred to by any name. Instead, at run-time the variable takes the form of a logical memory address that is referenced in the CPU operations that form the functionality of the program. Since SCHAECK2 (and for that matter, ABRAMS) does not describe or suggest that any **un-compiled source code** is used **at run-time** to generate a portal page that provides a view of an aggregated service based on a user's role, the Office

Action is incorrect in asserting that computer art knowledge of variables and symbolic names suggests the mapping of Claim 1 between page parameter names and portlet parameter names.

4. ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 do not describe or suggest several other features of Claim 1

It is noted that Claim 1 includes one or more additional features that are not described by ABRAMS and/or SCHAECK2. For example, the Office Action uses a combination of ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 to allege a prior disclosure of several features of Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that, contrary to the allegation in the Office Action, the combination of the teachings of ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 does not describe or suggest these features of Claim 1. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time.

For the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS and SCHAECK2, when taken alone or in combination, do not describe or suggest all features of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

B. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 18

Claim 18 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 includes features similar to the features of Claim 1 discussed above. For example, among other features Claim 18 comprises:

> generating and storing a **first mapping** that **maps** one or more events to one or more actions and **one or more event output parameter names** to **one or more page parameter names**, **wherein the first mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with one or more page parameters that correspond to the one or more page parameter names**;
> …;

retrieving and inspecting the first mapping, wherein **inspecting the first mapping** includes:

determining, based on the first mapping and the intercepted data, an action to perform in response to the particular event;

**based on the first mapping, determining that an event output parameter name, which corresponds to an event output parameter associated with the particular event, is mapped to a particular page parameter name**; and

causing the action to be performed, wherein **causing the action to be performed** comprises **passing a value associated with the event output parameter name as the value of a particular page parameter that corresponds to the particular page parameter name**;

. . . .

It is respectfully submitted that at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1, ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 do not describe or suggest the above features of Claim 18.

Further, Claim 18 includes one or more additional features that are not described by ABRAMS and/or SCHAECK2. For example, the Office Action uses a combination of ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 to allege a prior disclosure of several features of Claim 18. It is respectfully submitted that, contrary to the allegation in the Office Action, the combination of the teachings of ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 does not describe or suggest these features of Claim 18. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 18 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2 for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 18 is respectfully requested.

C. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 49

Claim 49 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2.

Claim 49 includes features similar to the features of Claim 1 discussed above, except in the context of a computer-readable medium. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 49 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2 for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 49 is respectfully requested.

D. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 66

Claim 66 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2.

Claim 66 includes features similar to the features of Claim 18 discussed above, except in the context of a computer-readable medium. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 66 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2 for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 18. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 66 is respectfully requested.

E. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, AND 67-72

Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-22, 50-51, 53-62, 64-65, and 67-72 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2. Claims 4 and 52 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2, and further in view of Hind et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0205555 ("HIND"). Claims 6, 9-12, 23, and 47 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2, and further in view of Polizzi et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0052954 ("POLIZZI"). Claims 15 and 63 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK2, and further in view of Katariya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,564,251 ("KATARIYA").

Each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 depends directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66, and thus includes each and every feature of the independent base claim. Furthermore, in rejecting Claims 4, 6, 9-12, 15, 23, 47, 52, and 63 the Office Action relies explicitly on ABRAMS and SCHAECK2, and not on HIND, POLIZZI, or KATARIYA, to show the features discussed above with respect to Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66. Because ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 do not teach the subject matter of Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66, any combination of ABRAMS and SCHAECK2 with the other three references necessarily fails to teach the complete combination recited in any dependent claim of Claims 1, 18, 49, or 66. Thus, each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 is allowable for the reasons given above for Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66.

In addition, each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 is respectfully requested.

## II. CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed. Further, for the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: January 6, 2011

/StoychoDDraganoff#56181/
Stoycho D. Draganoff
Reg. No. 56,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 208
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076